

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application based on the foregoing Amendment and the following Remarks is respectfully requested.

This is a first Official Action following the applicant's Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on October 14, 2003 with a Response based on the Final Rejection of July 14, 2003.

Claims 9-14 had been earlier considered allowable by the Examiner. To enhance the recitation of the limitations of the present invention, the applicant made a major amendment to the claims and added new claims, summarized as follows.

1. Claims 1-2 were cancelled without prejudice.
2. The dependency of claims 3, 7, 15 and 4, 8, 16 was changed to allowed claims 9 and 10, respectively.
3. The dependency of claims 5 and 6 was changed to new claims 29 and 30, respectively.
4. Allowed claims 9-14 were each rewritten into independent form.
5. New claims 17-28 were added and each depend from one of the allowed claims 9-14.
6. New independent claims 29 and 31 were added.
7. New dependent claims 30 and 32-54 were added which depend from new independent claims 29 and 31, as appropriate.

**Allowable Subject Matter: Claims 3-4 and 7-28**

The Examiner has allowed claims 3-4 and 7-28.

The applicant notes that claims 3-4, 7-8, and 15-28 depend from the previously allowed claims 9-14.

**Objection: Claim 14**

The Examiner objects to claim 14 as containing an informality. Specifically, the limitation "ata" should be corrected to read --at a--

In response, the applicant has made the appropriate correction required by the Examiner.

**35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejections: Claims 5-6 and 29-54**

The Examiner has rejected claims 5-6 and 29-54 allegedly as being anticipated by Budde et al (US 6,233,124 B1 - filed May 13, 1999 - issued May 15, 2001).

The Budde et al reference was cited previously. As noted above, claims 5-6, 30, and 32-54 are dependent claims which depend from either claim 29 or claim 31, as appropriate. Therefore the rejection is only against the new claims which depend from new independent claims 29 and 31.

In the applicant's response of October 14, 2003, the applicant identified the differences between new claims 29 and 31 versus cancelled claim 1. In particular, the applicant indicated that claim 29 is an amended version of claim 1, which recites the limitation: --and only portions of said actuator spring and said base plate surrounding said pair of driving voids are laser spot welded.--.

The applicant stated that claim 29 recites limitations which are supported by the specification with regard to location of the jwelding points 20. Furthermore, the applicant stated that in claim 29, the limitation regarding the actuator spring and the base plate of "both of which overlap each other," has been deleted.

With respect to claim 31, the applicant stated that claim 31 is also an amended version of claim 1, which recites --said magnetic head supporting section and said actuator spring being formed separately from one another,--. Therefore, the applicant stated that claim 31 recites that the actuator spring and the load beam [, i.e., the magnetic head supporting section,] are formed separately.

Despite the foregoing statements showing the new limitations present in claims 29 and 31, the applicant respectfully maintains that the current Official Action is identical to the Final Rejection of July 14, 2003. The only difference is that in the Final Rejection, the Examiner identified the specific claims, such as "As per claim 1," "As per claim 2," etc. against which he was asserting that Budde et al discloses the limitations of the particular claim. In the current Official Action, such specific references to the claims have been omitted.

Therefore, since the current Official Action is otherwise identical to the Final Rejection of July 14, 2003, the applicant maintains that the Examiner has not fully considered the applicant's previous response and has not identified any portions of Budde et al which anticipate the new limitations of claims 29 and 31.

As a result, Budde et al do not disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 29 of "only portions of said actuator spring and said base plate surrounding said pair of driving voids are laser spot welded".

Neither do Budde et al disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 31 of "said magnetic head supporting section and said actuator spring being formed separately from one another".

Consequently, claims 29 and 31 patentably distinguish over Budde et al. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 5-6 and 29-54 over the prior art.

The foregoing Amendment and Remarks establish the patentable nature of all of the claims rejected and objected to which remain in the application, i.e., claims 5-6 and 29-54. No new matter has been added. Wherefore, early and favorable reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony N. Fresco  
Registration No. 45,784

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
516-742-4343/4366 FAX

ANF:yd